



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XVI.—THE ENAMoured MOSLEM PRINCESS IN ORDERIC VITAL AND THE FRENCH EPIC

In the tenth book of his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Orderic Vital gives an account of Bohemond's surprise and capture by the Turkish Emir, Daliman, and his imprisonment, with other French nobles, in one of the Emir's fortresses. Now there happened to live in this particular stronghold the Emir's daughter, Melaz. She had often heard the bravery of the Crusaders praised, and welcomed this opportunity to make the acquaintance of such famous heroes. So she would visit Bohemond and his friends in their dungeon and talk with them. Her favorite topic was the tenets of the Christian faith. Conversation naturally led to a good understanding and assistance on Melaz's part.

Two years went by. Daliman had become involved in a war with his brother, Soliman. To aid her father, Melaz had the French armed and sent to the front. Battle was already joined when they arrived. They charged, and Soliman's ranks wavered. Bohemond engaged Soliman's son in single combat and killed him. After great carnage the enemy fled. But true to a promise given Melaz, the French left the pursuit and returned to their prison, where, at Melaz's instigation, they overpowered their former jailors and seized the citadel.

It held an immense treasure. The royal palace stood close by. Consequently when Daliman came back from the war and proceeded to reproach Melaz for giving weapons to the French, at the same time threatening her and them with death at the stake, Bohemond could witness the scene from his post in the keep. He lost no time in coming to

Melaz's rescue, and assured her safety by making himself master of Daliman's person, an easy task, since the Emir's guards had scattered to find quarters in the town.

Thus relieved in regard to herself, Melaz began to work on her father. She reminded him that the French had won his battle for him, had returned when they could have escaped, and, as a matter of fact, could dispose of him as they pleased. Daliman admitted the force of these arguments and asked for advice. It was to make peace with the Christians, arrange for a general exchange of prisoners, and reward Bohemond. But whether the advice was taken or not, Melaz's mind was made up. She had turned Christian, and would abandon her father and his vile creed as well.

Violent gestures were Daliman's only reply, a demonstration which prompted Melaz to arrest all the Moslems in the palace, garrison it with the French and usurp the power. For a fortnight the Emir stood fast, and many were the curses he hurled at Mahomet, his god, at his former subjects and his faithless neighbors. But in the end he gave way to his sense of discretion and the persuasion of his men. He agreed to the terms proposed, and even promised Melaz in marriage to Bohemond. This submission, however, did not lull the prudent mind of Melaz, and she took the precaution of summoning Tancred from Antioch with a force strong enough to protect Bohemond's retreat. Moslem prisoners also accompanied Tancred, among them the former princess of Antioch, who came in tears, we are told, because she was compelled to bid farewell to pork. For though Turks enjoy the flesh of dogs and wolves, they abhor pork, "and thereby prove that they are without all the laws of Moses and Christ, and belong neither to the Jews nor the Christians."

But Melaz's precautions were unnecessary. Before Tancred could arrive, Daliman had been won over by the charms of Bohemond's conversation to join daughter and subjects in reviling Mahomet and extolling the power of Christ. The peace remained unbroken. The French journeyed quietly back to Antioch. Melaz soon followed them with her attendants, and a rousing welcome awaited all.

Bohemond's first care was to dispatch his friend, Richard, to St. Leonard's, in Limousin, with gifts of silver chains as thank-offerings for his deliverance. Melaz was baptized, and was persuaded by Bohemond to seek some other noble in marriage, for he himself had already suffered great hardships and was to undergo many others, and also must perforce discharge a vow he had made to Saint Leonard while in captivity. So a sorry husband he would make. Rather let her choose his cousin, Roger, his junior, handsome, high-born and rich. The reasoning was good, and the princess heeded it, and in the midst of universal plaudits the wedding took place.¹

A curious intermingling of fact and invention is this narrative of Orderic's. The framework is historical. Bohemond and his retinue were captured by surprise and held prisoners for several years. The vow to Saint Leonard and Bohemond's pilgrimage to the shrine in Limousin are also historical. In the continuation to Tudeboeuf's chronicle we even read that it was an offering of silver balls, like the balls on his chains, that Bohemond made to the saint,² a qualification which varies only slightly from the silver chains of Orderic. There is also an allusion to this vow in

¹ *Historia Ecclesiastica*, x, 23 (Edition of the Société de l'Histoire de France, Vol. iv, pp. 139-158).

² *Recueil des historiens occidentaux des Croisades*, Vol. III, p. 228.

Raoul de Caen, who visited Palestine in 1107,³ while Orderic on a later page tells of the actual visit to St. Leonard's.⁴

On the other hand, Bohemond's appearance in Daliman's battle-line is probably fictitious. We read in Albert of Aix that the Emir ("Donomannus") entered Bohemond's prison in quest of advice about the campaign, and that this conference led to the hero's ransom, for which the Emir was soundly rated by Soliman.⁵ But the incongruity of such a happening excites the suspicion that Albert is here affected by the same report which ascribed armed assistance in Orderic.

The general exchange of prisoners, however, finds corroboration in an anonymous Greek chronicle. The Moslem princess of Antioch even appears there, though without the regrets that Orderic notes.⁶ But Matthew of Edessa is not aware of any exchange. He says that Bohemond was ransomed, and that an Armenian chief was the principal mover in raising the ransom.⁷

Yet, while admitting that Orderic's account of Bohemond's captivity is substantiated at more than one point, we must confess that these substantiations confirm, after all, only a small portion of his story. The larger part is built around the person and deeds of Melaz, and of Melaz sober chronicle is silent. The Moslem princess who yields to the attractions of her father's French prisoner, befriends him, discusses religion with him, professes conversion to his creed and offers him hand and heart is well known to

³ *Op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 713.

⁴ *Hist. Ec.*, XI, 12 (edition cited, Vol. IV, pp. 211, 212).

⁵ *Recueil des hist. oc. etc.*, Vol. IV, pp. 524, 611 sq.

⁶ *Recueil des historiens orientaux etc.*, Vol. I, p. 212.

⁷ *Recueil des historiens des Croisades, Documents Arméniens*, Vol. I, p. 69.

medieval romance. So, too, is the Christian captive, who accepts this homage and profits by it, who through it aids his captor in war or seizes his palace and perhaps his person, and thus wrests an unwilling assent to the daughter's union. But of both knight and princess medieval history seems ignorant. Consequently the question comes to us, where did the legend, since legend there is, start? How did it enter into literature?

It is possible that the latter query may find an answer in Orderic himself. For it is his work which offers the earliest European version of the legend, dating as it does around 1135. But something like it had already appeared in the West, and had perhaps been assimilated to the main story by Orderic or Orderic's informant. We refer, of course, to the epic poem of *Mainet*.

The hero of *Mainet*, the future Charlemagne, had found refuge from his enemies with the Emir of Toledo, had helped him in his wars, had rid his daughter, Galienne, of an unwelcome Moslem suitor by means of a single combat, had been offered Galienne and the kingdom, had accepted the one but not the other, and had carried his willing bride back to France and a Christian wedding. But in all this there was no question of captivity, nor of release, nor of violence done the father, nor of religious variance. Indeed, matters went on as they may very well have gone on in tenth-century Spain, where Christian adventurers fought with Moslems against Moslems or Christians indifferently, and undoubtedly contracted more or less stable unions with Moslem women. The career of the great Almanzor, ruler of Cordova from 978 to 1002, might be cited as a partial proof of these elastic conditions. Almanzor used Christian mercenaries against his father-in-law and enemy, Ghalib, and Ghalib hired Christians, too. Almanzor also took

wives from among the high nobility of Castille and Leon. Of such a marriage his successor was born.

Contemporaneous in tradition with *Mainet*, as Professor Lang reminds me, and reflecting the same political and social conditions, is the Spanish poem of the *Infantes de Lara*. The father of the Laras had been sent to Almanzor to be executed, a Christian betrayed to a Moslem by a Christian. But the Moslem, respecting the victim, refused to do the evil work, and for death substituted imprisonment. He also committed the Spaniard to the care of a fair jailor, perhaps Almanzor's sister, who fell in love with her charge and bore him a son, who was destined to avenge the wrongs suffered by his father's family. Here again, though of quite a different tenor from *Mainet*, neither racial nor religious enmity forms the theme, and its resemblance to Orderic's account of Melaz's dealings with Bohemond remains wholly superficial, accidental. The essential plot is lacking to the *Infantes de Lara* quite as much as to *Mainet*.

Now what is the plot? What are the essential elements in the story of the enamoured Moslem princess? They are these: the release of a prisoner by the daughter of his captor; her conversion to his faith; her return with him to his native land. *Mainet* chanced upon one of the vital factors of the legend. It is wholly innocent of the others. And the approximation of the *Infantes de Lara* is seen to be of the feeblest.

Still two of these factors, the vital two, joined together in a close and logical combination, existed long before Orderic's time, before Almanzor's, before Charlemagne's, or even before Charles Martel's. Already at the beginning of the Christian era, Seneca the Rhetorician had formulated them in the heading of the sixth *controversia* of his

first book of questions for argumentation: "Captus a piratis scripsit patri (de) redemptione. Non redimebatur. Arcipiratae filia jurare eum coegit, ut duceret se uxorem si dimissus esset. Relicto patre secuta est adulescentem. Redit ad patrem, duxit illam. Orba incidit. Pater imperat ut arcipiratae filiam dimittat et orbem ducat. Nolentem abdicat." And the discussion that follows this outline casts further light on its incidents. The youth is shown lying in a dungeon ("in tenebris jacebam"), working on the sympathy of his tender-hearted (or ambitious) warden, promising her marriage for his freedom and urging her to fly with him. The story undoubtedly came to Seneca from the store of the Greek sophists. Nor did his version suffer much change in the Western world. The fifth tale of the *Gesta Romanorum*, of the thirteenth century, preserves all its fundamentals. The orphaned rival has fallen out, to be sure, but the father still threatens disinheritance if the son marries his rescuer—who is now promoted to the grade of princess, in keeping, perhaps, with Seneca's *arcipirata*.

Now what did Orderic know of Seneca's *controversia*, or of the antecedents of the coming *Gesta Romanorum*? Nothing, it is quite safe to say. His knowledge of the devotion of a Moslem princess to the captive Bohemond came to him from the East by the way of knight, minstrel or pilgrim, and it is in the East that we are likely to come upon the source of his story. The difference between that story and Seneca's *controversia*, apart from the admixture of military exploits with Orderic, mainly consists in the idea of the maiden's conversion to the faith of her captive. And Seneca's *controversia* was to receive this striking addition in one of those Oriental tales which were to make up the collection of the *Arabian Nights*.

The Magian, Bahram, has thrown Prince As'ad, a Moslem, into a dungeon beneath his house, and has set over him as tormentor his daughter, Bustan. But when Bustan went down to beat As'ad, his great beauty stayed her hand. Instead of blows, she freed him from his chains and began to talk with him. The conversation soon turned on questions of religion, and so persuasive were As'ad's words that after much instruction Bustan foreswore her faith for As'ad's, and gave him her heart in keeping as well. After she had nursed him back to health she learned of his identity by a crier and restored him to his family. Her father, however, was seized by the Sultan and condemned to death. He asked for a few moments' grace; they were granted, and he used them in abjuring Magianism. So his life was spared. Yet, notwithstanding all these services, Bustan did not receive her due reward. For As'ad was claimed by a former flame, and it was his older brother who finally married the submissive Bustan.⁸

When we compare the outline of this tale to Orderic's narrative we can hardly doubt that we have in it his principal source. Not only is the girl's conversion stressed with emphasis, but the eventual disposition of her hand is strangely like Melaz's fate, who was at last given to Bohemond's cousin and not to Bohemond. And the reason alleged in the *Nights* is the good one. As'ad was already bespoken. So with the fathers of the two heroines. After long resistance the charms of Bohemond's conversation won Daliman over to Christianity. Bahram rejected Mohammedanism until it was that or his head for him. Again the good reason is given by the *Nights*, and Orderic's appears again the derived version.

⁸ *Arabian Nights*, Tales 236, 237, 248. Cf. V. Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes*, Vol. v, pp. 209, 210.

Besides, as Professor LeCompte suggests, Orderic's account shows another strongly marked impress of its Eastern origin. All of the characters in his chronicle of Bohemond's adventures bear historical names of the day, save the most important one, the heroine. Her name had to be invented. All the names of the *Arabian Nights* tale are descriptive, and if this were Orderic's ultimate source, the fabrication of a descriptive name, to add to those furnished by history, would be wholly in keeping. So Melaz would be borrowed from the Greek adjective μέλας, black or swarthy. But the adoption of this appellative indicates Greek territory. The earlier form of this tale of the *Nights* would, therefore, have been carried to Orderic from Syria or Byzantium.

Indeed, if you set that tale, even as we now know it, into the authenticated framework of Bohemond's captivity and release, you need but two more incidents to make Orderic's narrative complete. One is the assistance rendered the captor by his prisoner in war; the other is the seizure of the captor's fortress by the prisoner, at the daughter's instigation. Current French epic could have easily supplied both. We have noticed the former in *Mainet*. The latter was apparently numbered among the exploits of William of Orange, and has been handed down to us, though considerably modified, probably, by the poem of the *Prise d'Orange*.

Considerably modified, and perhaps affected by an echo of the *Nights* tale itself. The beginning, however, is wholly unlike that tale. William enters Orange not as a captive, but as one attracted thither by the fame of Orable's beauty. With him are several comrades. All are disguised as Turks. They excite Orable's sympathy by their accounts of William's prowess, so that when their disguise

is finally penetrated she yields to their entreaties and promises of reward far enough to give them the arms with which they drive the Saracens from the tower. Their triumph is brief. Overcome by numbers, they are thrown into a dungeon, where Orable soon comes to visit them. She tells them she will free them if William will marry her, and she will also adopt their faith. William consents, binds himself by pledge and oath, and they are released. At Orable's suggestion they send home for aid, seize the tower again and hold it until help comes. The poem concludes with the baptism and wedding of Orable, who brings Orange in dower to William.

After all, then, the heroine of the poem does free the prisoners and marry their leader. She undergoes conversion and baptism, too. But the French were really not captives. They had put themselves in the enemy's power out of curiosity. Nor was Orable a maiden and a daughter of the Pagan. She was his wife. Nor did she follow her lover home. On the contrary, she set him over her own land, and together they ruled Orange. So the plot of the *Prise d'Orange* at bottom is quite different from the traditional plot of the rescued captive. Its likeness to Orderic's narrative comes from the marriage of a princess to a foreigner she has befriended, and her apostasy. But Orable reminds you strongly of Melaz. She possesses Melaz's prudence and wise determination. Consequently, the resemblances between the epic and Orderic are striking enough to suggest the idea that a connection may have existed between them, and that Orderic's source, or Orderic himself, may have given the poem its tone and at least one of its episodes.

But we should also remember that Orderic was familiar with the story of William of Orange, and knew an earlier

Prise d'Orange,⁹ from which he could have easily borrowed the tower motive. His informant could have done this, too, and if we are inclined to believe it was the informant, and not Orderic, who made the loan, it is because this particular incident appears elsewhere in another version, where the notion of military aid, which Orderic stresses, does not appear. Orderic, therefore, would find the tower motive in his source. How plausible this conclusion about the origin of the tower motive in Orderic may be can be seen by the comparison of his account with this new version, the version contained in the epic poem of *Fierabras*.

Oliver has won his duel with the giant, but with several comrades falls victim to Pagan treachery, and is lodged in a dungeon of the Emir of Spain. The Emir's daughter, Floripas, hears the lamentations of the captives and goes to relieve them. She kills their jailor, who would oppose her, and releases the knights, but only after they have sworn fealty to her. She leads them to her room, exacts a pledge of complete obedience to her, and finally confesses her love for the absent Guy of Burgundy. For him she would even renounce her faith.

Soon Guy comes upon the stage, as one of an embassy sent the Emir by Charlemagne. The reception of the embassy is insulting, its retort defiant, and the Emir plans to put its members to death. While he is deliberating with his leading men, Floripas enters the hall, grasps the situation at once, urges on her father, and asks for the custody of the prisoners in the meantime. This is granted, and Guy, with his friends, rejoins Oliver's party. All pledge again to obey Floripas, and Guy, facing death as an alternative, accepts her love.

But there is a Moslem suitor, whose suspicions are

⁹ J. Bédier, *Les légendes épiques*, Vol. I, p. 121.

aroused by Floripas's long absence, and who breaks into her room to his own destruction. Floripas seizes this crisis as the moment to act. The French rush into the hall, drive out the Saracens, and make themselves masters of palace and tower. The Emir besieges them there. As in Orderic, the tower held much treasure, but lacked provisions, and Guy, sallying forth to get food, was first captured, then rescued. Provisions are obtained, and the garrison stand off the enemy until Charlemagne comes. The Emir, refusing to recant, is slain, with his daughter's entire approval. Floripas is baptized, married to Guy, and is crowned queen with him over her inheritance.

Here is an account singularly like Orderic's. So much so, indeed, that we may almost assume it was derived from the same original. It omits the idea of military aid rendered the captor, which is in Orderic, and it introduces the motive of the rival suitor—lacking in Orderic unless Soliman's son, who is worsted in single combat by Bohemond, is a faint shadow of him. It presents two rescues of Christian knights by the heroine, after the manner of the *Prise d'Orange*, it has the Emir beheaded instead of allowing him to recant, and it invests Guy with Floripas's lands, as William had been with Orable's. But all these are pure differences of incident. They do not touch the plot, which remains the same, with the exception of the traditional elopement of the heroine. And the heroine remains the same also, prudent, quick in decision, wise in counsel. Surely, the old romance was endowed with great tenacity of life, a tenacity all the more surprising here because the author of *Fierabras* knew of the adventures of Charles and Galienne, and yet did not incorporate them into his story, as we have supposed Orderic Vital did.¹⁰

¹⁰ This knowledge of *Mainet* on our poet's part is shown in the

The intimate relation of the *Fierabras* version to Orderic's account is further indicated by the free treatment the story received at the hands of other writers. The author of *Elie de Saint-Gilles*, for instance, makes the Emir offer the captured Elie his daughter, Rosamond, provided he will turn Pagan. Elie refuses and escapes. Later he is wounded by the infidels, and is secretly carried to Rosamond's tower. She has the power of healing wounds, and Elie is quickly restored to health. In gratitude he becomes her champion against an unwelcome suitor, kills her brother, who has abused her for favoring a Christian, stands a siege by her father in her tower and is finally rescued by Louis. The father is put to death, Rosamond is baptized, and (in the original version) married to Elie. She must have also brought him her land in dower, in the original, inasmuch as she seems to be the sole survivor of the family.

The variations of *Elie de Saint-Gilles* are, as we see, not particularly vital. In spite of its strong immixture of romantic incident, it still preserves the traditional trend of the Eastern story. But with the *Siège de Barbastre* the matter is quite otherwise, and we miss in it essential

warning the Emir receives from one of his council, when Floripas is asking him for the custody of the defiant embassy:

Du rice Challemaine vous devoit ramenbrer,
Que tant nori Galafre, qui l'ot fait adouber;
Puis li tolli sa fille, Galiene au vis cler,
L'enfant Garsilium en fist desirer.

Fierabras, li. 2735-38, as corrected by Gaston
Paris, *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne*, p. 232.

In considering the investment of the hero with the heroine's lands, in both the *Prise d'Orange* and *Fierabras*, we should remember that Galafre offered to give Charles his kingdom and Galienne, if he would stay in Spain, an offer which may have suggested the dénouement of the two younger poems.

features of the old plot. For the rescue of the captured Commarcis family and its retainers from the tower of Barbastre is accomplished by a Saracen of the town, who thus avenges his private wrongs on the Emir. And the heroine is not the Emir's daughter. She is Malatrie of Cordova, betrothed to the Emir's son, and she is summoned by the Emir to the camp where he is besieging his capital, now in the power of the French. But Malatrie has fallen in love with Girard de Commarcis by hearsay, and has her tent pitched near the tower in the wall, which he is defending. So when Girard makes a sortie one day he comes upon her, and learns of her love. He returns it, and soon contrives her escape into the city. Her Moslem suitor is unhorsed by him in one of the many combats which fill out the poem, and, the French resisting until Louis raises the siege, the union of knight and princess eventually takes place.¹¹

After Orderic, therefore, the story of the enamoured Moslem princess suffered deterioration. Even in *Fierabras*, nearest of the French versions to Orderic, the situation is less simple, the recital more labored. Consequently it is Orderic's narrative that is of paramount importance in the history of the tale in the West. And as Seneca undoubtedly got his caption for argumentation from his Greek teachers of rhetoric, so Orderic as surely heard about Bohemond and Melaz from a returned pilgrim or Crusader. The story-tellers of the Eastern Empire had obstinately refused to forget the romance of the rescued captive, and when reviving religious zeal drove the votaries of Mohammed on to the war with older creeds, the added episode of the rout of Magianism endowed its well-known

¹¹ Ph. A. Becker, *Le Siège de Barbastre*, in *Festgabe für G. Gröber*, pp. 252-266.

incidents with a deeper meaning. Little wonder that the Christians of Godfrey de Bouillon should take advantage of its renewed popularity to restate its moral. To adapt it, however, to the known facts of Bohemond's capture and ransom demanded brains and imagination. This adaptation was surely the work of a man of talent.

Who was this man of talent, of brains and imagination? Is it possible it was Bohemond himself? Could any other than he or his comrades in trouble have possessed the authority to make such a fable pass muster with a sober Latin chronicler? On a later page of his book Orderic tells how Bohemond made his pilgrimage to St. Leonard's in the winter of 1106, paid his vow to the saint, and passed on to a veritable tour of central France. During Lent he visited many castles and towns, made many gifts to shrines, and stood godfather to many children. And everywhere he went he told of his recent experiences. Even at Easter, after he had married Constance of France at Chartres, he took his stand before the high-altar of the cathedral and, with the recital of his own fortunes and exploits, exhorted his audience to follow him against the Greek emperor.¹² And what more telling illustration of the glories of a Crusader's career in Syria could he have used than the story of Melaz's devotion to the French and her conversion to the true faith?

In the spring of 1106 Orderic made a visit to the region north of the Loire.¹³ The countryside was ringing with Bohemond's praises. Orderic may have learned of the hero's "fortunes and exploits" from his own lips. He certainly heard them told by many who had seen him, and, as

¹² *Hist. Ec.*, XI, 12 (edition cited, Vol. IV, pp. 210-213). Orderic's words about Bohemond's plea are: "Casus suos et res gestas enarravit."

¹³ *Op. cit.*, XI, 15 (edition cited, Vol. IV, p. 215).

was his habit, we may suppose he wrote them down. Did they already contain their epic embellishments, the military aid rendered Daliman, the seizure of his tower? A score of years and more were to pass before they were to assume their final shape, years echoing with epic song, and it may well be that during this interval these incidents were added to the original story. But the presence of the tower episode in *Fierabras* might imply that this event had already been incorporated into Orderic's source. The other, wanting in *Fierabras*, Orderic would have adapted from *Mainet*.¹⁴

Now if our conclusion that the story of the enamoured Moslem princess reaches back through its Mohammedan revision to the Greek tale of the rescued captive is well founded, we might derive from its very genealogy the explanation of an interesting feature of its psychology, the character of the heroine. The traits of a Melaz or a Floripas or an Orable—for we may perhaps consider the extant *Prise d'Orange* a product in part of the Eastern story—are not the traits of the medieval woman of the West. Compare their dispositions, for instance, with Bertha's in *Girard de Roussillon*. Even Galienne, who forsakes her own land and creed for her lover's, and who, we may presume, had imbibed some of the spirit of Bustan through Arabic in-

¹⁴ Orderic's loans from the story of William, and perhaps also from the *Chanson de Roland*, in his account of an event that happened while he was in the midst of composing his *Historia*, show how he could combine epic tradition with historical fact. See *The Battle of Fraga and Larchamp in Orderic Vital, Modern Philology*, XI (January, 1914), pp. 339-346.

Orderic could also be the most faithful of reporters, as his picture of the Moslem Princess of Antioch in tears over her farewell to pork proves. The scene must have been intended to raise a laugh in the crowd, but Orderic fails to give us the least notion of humor in it. Nor does he elsewhere in his long narrative.

termediaries, is not the principal actor in *Mainet*. Her sole initiative seems to consist in warding off threatened danger from Charles. But Melaz and her sisters are the action itself. They guide and direct. The knights heed their least word. They are the genuine descendants of the pirate's daughter, who made absolute conformity to her behests, even to the extreme of marriage, the price of her prisoner's freedom. And if the dominance of Bustan in the *Arabian Nights* is not so evident, we may assume that it is because the traditional qualities in her, and which she must have possessed at the end of the eleventh century, had suffered much toning down by the process of harmonizing them with the social conditions prevalent when the collection was given its final shape.

The masterful nature of these women, foreign to France and to the feminine ideal of the French, would therefore be ancestral, inherited. It would have been bequeathed to them by their virile progenitor of classical antiquity. Did their example affect in any degree their more retiring sisters of the West, nurtured in the true faith? Did the romantic heroines of the end of the twelfth century, the Idoines, the Aelises, the Lienors, owe to them some measure of their prudent self-confidence? It would be difficult to say. Orderic, for one, seems to have been impressed by the type. For when he has to chronicle the capture of Baldwin II, of Jerusalem, and his confinement in a Turkish fortress, he (or again it may be his informant) patterns the situation on the adventures of Bohemond and Melaz. Baldwin and his companions free themselves and seize the stronghold. The Emir besieges them to no purpose, and then offers an advantageous armistice. The French are about to accept it, when Fatumia, the Emir's wife, appears in the midst of their council (she resided in this fort-

ress), urges them to break off negotiations and rely on the castle's strength and their valorous renown as knights of France. Should they successfully resist, she will embrace Christianity.¹⁵

The name, Fatumia, betrays the tongue of the returned pilgrim or Crusader. And Fatumia is not altogether a Melaz, any more than Baldwin is anywhere near a Bohe-mond. She is neither a sweetheart, nor a rescuer. But she is all the rest: a resolute adviser, an enemy to her own people, a willing apostate. In her mental attributes, at least, she fairly takes her stand beside Floripas, Orable and Melaz, a worthy specimen of those resourceful infidel princesses who compelled the unqualified admiration of the romancers of Christian France.

F. M. WARREN.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, XI, 26 (edition cited, Vol. IV, pp. 252-255).